DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 383 CS 212 672

AUTHOR Nelson, Carol; Smith, Carl, Comp.
TITLE Evaluating the Progress of the School Reading Program. Learning Package No. 17.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. School of Education.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 45p.; For other learning packages in this series, see CS 212 656-705. Some material in the packet may not be completely legible when reproduced; copies provided are the best available.
AVAILABLE FROM Learning Packages, ERIC/RCS, Indiana University, Smith Research Center, Suite 150, 2805 E. 10th St., Bloomington, IN 47408-2698 ($14.00).
PUB TYPE Guides - Classroom Use - Teaching Guides (For Teacher) (052) -- Collected Works - General (020)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Distance Education; *Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Needs Assessment; Program Content; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Reading Achievement; *Reading Instruction; *Reading Programs; Reading Skills; *Teacher Effectiveness; Teacher Role; Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Educational Issues; Reading Management

ABSTRACT

Originally developed for the Department of Defense Schools (DoDDS) system, this learning package on evaluating the progress of the school reading program is designed for teachers who wish to upgrade or expand their teaching skills on their own. The package includes a comprehensive search of the ERIC database; a lecture giving an overview on the topic; the full text of several papers on the topic; copies of any existing ERIC/RCS publications on the topic; a set of guidelines for completing a goal statement, a reaction paper, and an application project; and an evaluation form. (KEH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333383

ERIC/RCS
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47405

Learning Package #17

Evaluating the Progress of the School Reading Program

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CS212672

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Dr. Carl Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

OVERVIEW

ERIC/RCS Learning Packages contain just what the practitioner needs for staff development workshops. Workshops can begin with an overview lecture , continue through readings and discussion material, and end with research projects and an annotated bibliography for further research.

Each learning package contains (1) a topic overview: a four-to-six page stage-setter; (2) in most cases, a digest of research: an ERIC summary of research on the topic written by a specialist; (3) a goal statement and a survey form; and (4) an extensive annotated bibliography of ERIC references.

Graduate-level university credit is available. For further information contact Indiana University School of Continuing Studies, Owen Hall #204, Bloomington, Indiana 47405. Enrollment in each course will be limited.

EVALUATING THE PROGRESS OF THE SCHOOL READING PROGRAM

by Carol Nelson

Lecture

(All references are fully documented in enclosed bibliography, or on reference list attached to this lecture)

Probably more efforts are made to evaluate reading instruction than any other curriculum area. In spite of these efforts, the evaluation of reading remains shrouded in misunderstanding and misinterpretation. Many attempts to evaluate reading programs and student reading achievement effectively have served only to confuse the issues rather than to clarify them.

Too often evaluation is set up as an afterthought; it is something that a teacher or administrator has been told to do. The evaluators thus have no ownership of the evaluation plan or the resulting data. They are evaluating to satisfy someone else. Often no one seems to know why the evaluation data are being gathered.

Many teachers and administrators confuse evaluation and testing. The terms are not synonymous. Testing, often further defined more narrowly as standardized testing, is but one evaluation strategy. Because teachers do not know why they are evaluating or what they are evaluating, they have not considered how they are going to evaluate. They limit themselves to one

evaluation strategy, such as testing, although there are many others available.

According to Smith et al. (1978), evaluation of the reading program should be planned by addressing systematically the questions of **why** the evaluation will be done, **what** will be evaluated, **how** the evaluation will be done, and how to do the evaluation **well**. The following discussion will focus upon each of these questions in turn.

Why Evaluate Reading?

Evaluation is defined as the "determination of the worth of something" (Worthen and Sanders, 1973). It is an attempt to determine whether some product, process, activity, or procedure is of value or is satisfactory. How well is it doing? How well should it be doing? Evaluation includes asking questions about the product or process, determining what is valuable about it, gathering objective and reliable information about it, and assessing its overall worth.

Evaluation is an immediate and pragmatic way of answering day to day questions and making decisions about reading. "Should Nancy go on to the next primer?" "Has Tommy mastered the concept of 'main idea'?" "Are teachers implementing the reading program we designed last year?" "Were our in-service workshops effective?" These are the kinds of questions that demand evaluation. They are action-oriented questions, questions

that demand immediate answers if good instructional decisions are to be made.

Unfortunately, many teachers and administrators faced with the day-to-day load of correcting papers, preparing lessons, keeping records, disciplining, and instructing, consider evaluation a luxury. Their prevalent attitude is that they do not have the time to evaluate regularly. Therefore, they will evaluate only when outside pressure demands it.

Evaluation is not a luxury; it is essential. It aids informed decision making in the classroom or school, and it contributes to the teacher's own learning. Many teachers forget that to be good teachers, they must first and foremost be good students. They must keep the spirit of personal inquiry alive, and take an active interest in their own professional actions and observations. As Schaefer (1967) notes, "Teaching, more than any other vocation, perhaps ought both to permit and to encourage the pursuit of meaning beyond any current capacity to comprehend."

Reading evaluation is effective only when you affirm a need for objective, reliable information. If you need to be more confident of what you know about the teaching of reading going on in your school, if you want to model the spirit of inquiry that you profess for your colleagues and students, and if you require better information for professional decision making, then you need evaluation.

Evaluate "What" in Reading?

Many teachers and administrators do not know where to begin. Although they sense why they should be evaluating, they are unable to translate philosophy into operation. In those circumstances, an evaluation needs assessment can play an important role in getting started.

A needs assessment is an attempt to identify whether additional information is required to support decisions currently being made about reading instruction. If there is a discrepancy between the ideal goal and the reality of the present circumstances, there is a need. Smith likens this discrepancy to a doctor who has a goal for you of a 98.6 degree temperature. He will view with alarm a temperature of 104 degrees. There is clearly a discrepancy between your ideal and your real state. You have an immediate health need, and he will suggest a curative intervention.

Similarly, you can determine if there is a discrepancy between the information required to make professional decisions and the information available. To do that, you must ask several questions:

1. What educational decisions do I make or influence?
2. What questions do I need answered in order to make those decisions?
3. Am I satisfied with the quality of the information that I am using to address questions?

Classroom teachers, principals, and reading specialists all make, help to make, or influence many important decisions about the reading program. To assess your role in influencing decisions, you might consider the following questions:

- Do I determine if individual students are ready for reading instruction in my class or school? What decisions am I likely to make? (Readiness and screening.)
- Do I determine what kind of reading instruction an individual student should receive? Do I ever change that instruction? What decisions am I likely to make? (Reading instruction.)
- Do I communicate with parents about the quality of their child's progress in reading? What am I likely to report? (Parent reporting.)
- Do I ever refer students with reading problems for special help? What decisions am I likely to make? (Diagnosis and remediation.)
- Do I ever determine the reading curriculum that I will be using? What decisions am I likely to make? (Curriculum).
- Do I ever select instructional materials for the reading program? (Instruction.)
- Do I ever help to determine the resource level that my school will devote to the reading program? (Management.)
- What changes in the reading program am I currently helping to determine? (Improvement of instruction.)

By responding to each question you will begin to identify important decisions. Evaluation is useful to the extent that it supports or influences professional decisions. It may be a decision to continue what you have been doing, or to do nothing.

By responding to each of the questions above, you will begin to identify decisions about reading that you make or influence. As you face such decisions, you usually will have to confront additional questions that clarify your options and constraints. Every teacher or administrator making decisions about a student or program must come to grips in some fashion with evaluation questions. In order to answer these questions, the teacher or administrator will make a judgment based on some kind of information. That information may come from standardized tests, classroom observation, informal testing procedures, and/or consultation with other teachers or administrators.

After the list of needs has been assembled and the information gathered, an evaluation program or blueprint should be prepared. There are many models for evaluation. One very effective model, the CIPP, is discussed in this package. It has proven useful in helping teachers and administrators better understand evaluation.

How to Evaluate Reading

Other packages in this series discuss evaluation procedures and tools. Briefly, both formal (standardized) and informal evaluative devices are available. Formal procedures generally fall into one of two categories -- group-administered or individually-

administered. Group-administered tests are procedures such as survey reading tests, diagnostic reading tests, achievement tests, and intelligence tests. Individually-administered procedures include oral reading tests, diagnostic reading tests, auditory discrimination tests, auditory and visual screening tests, and intelligence tests. Some of these may be administered by the teacher; others are to be administered only by those with special training.

Informal diagnostic procedures are designed to help the classroom teacher gain the best specific information about each student in his/her class. Some of these procedures are attitude and interest surveys, observation with accompanying anecdotal records, the Informal Reading Inventory (IRI), word recognition inventories, criterion-referenced and objective-referenced tests, cloze procedure and Group Reading Inventory.

The overwhelming consensus of researchers is that no one device should be used alone. Formal diagnosis should be used to supplement informal procedures. Informal procedures allow more latitude in the testing situation; they are not bound by the standardization procedures required of formal tests.

How to Evaluate Well

Most of the articles included in this package (Guzzetti and Marzano, Silvern, and Baumann) discuss what current research tells administrators effective teaching should look like in the

classroom. Just as there are many ways to evaluate a student's reading, there are many ways to evaluate a teacher's reading instruction. Just as a teacher should never determine a student's reading achievement by one test, neither should that teacher be judged by one criterion. We tell teachers that observation is a powerful evaluative tool. Administrators also need to be observing in the classroom to see what kinds of teaching strategies are being used. If teachers and administrators keep current with research in the reading field, they will know that methods used 10 or 20 years ago may not be what is best today. Just as the basal reading series have had major changes in content and methods, so too must everyday classroom practices change.

For example, some current research shows that teachers who extend their basal reading series with a diverse array of materials, including real children's literature, have a higher rate of success. All classrooms must have a wide selection of reading materials available for students. Students should be able to choose whether or not they want to read, and should be given time during the school day to read books of their choice.

Likewise, teachers at all levels should read aloud regularly to their students. Administrators should be aware that this is a very effective tool. They should not act like the principal who, walking into a classroom where the teacher was reading to her third graders, said, "Oh. I'll Come back when you are teaching."

The evaluation of reading for both the student and the program is a prominent ingredient in maintaining a quality reading program. Although educational evaluation is still a young science, it is having a profound effect on reading and reading instruction.

Intense debates are currently raging within the reading research community on the need for reading evaluation, strategies for reading evaluation, and the control of quality in reading evaluation. Missing to date is the widespread involvement of teachers and administrators in these debates. Because preparation in evaluation has not been part of the practitioner's training, he or she is burdened with a negative attitude, insufficient skills, or both. Evaluation of reading efforts is the business of all of us.

References

Schaefer, R. (1967) *The school as a center of inquiry*. New York: Harper and Row.

Smith, R., Otto, W., & Hansen, L. (1976). *The school reading program*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Shannon, Albert J. "Monitoring Reading Instruction in the Content Areas." *Journal of Reading* (1984): 128-134.

Worthen, B. & Sanders, J. (1973). *Educational evaluation: Theory and practice*. Worthington, OH: Charles A. Jones.

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE ON READING AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS

June 1989 DIGEST

How Well Do Tests Measure Real Reading?

by Janet L. Powell

Despite a significant increase in test usage across the country, numerous issues surrounding the testing of reading remain unresolved. (See Johnston, 1986.) How validly it reflects what people actually do when they read is the most important consideration of any reading test. Construct validity – whether the test actually measures aspects of the behavior under consideration – is of particular importance if one is to rely on test scores to direct instruction, predict performance, or determine accountability. In 1917, Thorndike (see 1971 reprint), who defined reading as reasoning, helped promote the examination of reading as a cognitive process as thought guided by printed symbols (Farr and Roser, 1979).

Are we measuring process?

This slowly but continually emerging trend to recognize reading as a thinking process has been at the core of the controversies over the validity of various forms of reading assessment. Many critics of reading tests claim that most current approaches to the assessment of reading comprehension remain – as they have always been – measures of reading comprehension as a product of a reader's interaction with a text. Unable to assess the processes involved in comprehension, the tests measure comprehension as required responses that are the products of reading (Johnston, 1983).

Virtually all methods of assessing reading are indirect, even those that *claim* to directly assess reading *processes*. We cannot actually see the processes involved; we can only infer how a reader has comprehended. Therefore, all scores or data produced by tests of reading are indirect measures of the reading process.

The product of reading should, however, reflect the process the test-taker uses to generate the responses that produce a reading comprehension test score. That is to say that one ought to be able to assume that differences in test scores across test-takers and testing instances will reflect differences in the processes used to read the test passage and to respond as directed. How *directly* the two relate has never been determined; nor do we know how effectively test results can inform and direct the teaching of reading behaviors – even when those behaviors appear to be very similar to those that produce the test product. How well tests that do not emphasize or examine product might direct instruction that purports to develop process is a matter even less well understood.

Farr (1986) states that "the manuals of most standardized tests make very explicit the fact that the test will not provide information about a pupil's reading *processes*, but only information about the *product* of reading." However, he continues by saying that "...one could argue that the product – or score – isn't valid if a pupil doesn't use the actual processes of reading in determining the answers." The validity question that surrounds the tests thus seems to be whether or not taking the test *appears* to change the processes involved in comprehension and to solicit significantly atypical reading processes.

Metacognition focuses on process

A reader's awareness of thought processes involved in reading has recently come to be known as *metacognition*, and test designers are now including items that supposedly measure this (Aronson and Farr, 1988). The general knowledge of the reader guides him or her in monitoring comprehension processes through the selection and implementation of specific strategies to achieve some predetermined goal or purpose for reading. The chief idea involved in metacognition is that learners must actively monitor their use of thinking processes – that they must be aware of how they are processing information – and that they can then regulate them according to the purpose for reading.

The interest in metacognition among reading educators has led to an exploration of procedures to collect data on thinking processes. Data collection on mental processes has become known as *introspective data – concurrent* and *retrospective* verbal reports. Concurrent verbal reports are collected *as the subject is engaged in the reading task*. These types of reports have been criticized for interfering with the normal processes of reading (Nisbett and Wilson, 1977; Garner, 1982). Retrospective verbal reports are collected after the subject has completed the reading task. These types of reports have been criticized because subjects may forget or inaccurately recall the mental processes they employed while completing the task (Afflerbach and Johnston, 1984).

There are differences of opinion as to the validity and reliability of verbal report data in general. However, many prominent researchers agree that verbal reports, when they are elicited with care and interpreted with full understanding of the circumstances under which they were obtained, are valuable and thoroughly reliable sources of information about cognitive processes (Afflerbach and Johnston, 1984).

Verbal reports may reveal reading processes

Research that focuses on the metacognitive aspects of reading while taking a reading test comprise only a very small portion of the literature. At least three studies, however, have used verbal reports to investigate reading processes as subjects are engaged in taking reading comprehension tests. Using concurrent verbal reports, Wingenbach (1984) examined the comprehension processes employed by twenty gifted readers in grades 4 through 7 to identify the metacognitive strategies they employed as they read the *Iowa Test of Basic Skills*, a multiple-choice standardized reading test.

Wingenbach found that subjects reported using a variety of reading strategies to comprehend the text and to answer the questions. The strategies included using context clues, rereading, inferencing, personal identification with the text, and imagery. Wingenbach did not use as a comparison any other text types, making it impossible to determine whether or not the subject's mental processing was different on the test than on any other reading task.

Alvermann and Ratekin (1982) conducted a study with 98 "average" seventh-grade and eighth-grade subjects. The subjects completed a multiple-choice test and an essay test. Only retrospective reports were collected. Results of an analysis of the verbal protocols revealed that 55 subjects reported using only one reading strategy, while 30 reported using two or more. Thirteen subjects were unable to recall any specific strategy. In the report, Alvermann and Ratekin elaborate only on the statistically significant differences in strategies. They found that subjects who read to respond on an essay test "reread" more frequently than students who read the same passage knowing they will respond to multiple-choice items. In addition, subjects who read to complete an essay test reported using multiple strategies nearly twice as often as students who read for a multiple-choice test.

Other differences that were not statistically significant, may be important nevertheless. An examination of a chart representing the frequency of reported strategies shows that students read for details twice as often in the multiple-choice test as they did in the essay test. There were four reports of imaging (forming a picture of the text) in the essay test compared to one in the multiple-choice test. Subjects made a personal connection with the text an average of seven times when taking the multiple-choice test but only three during the essay test.

The use of only retrospective verbal reports severely limits the conclusions made by the researchers. When retrospection alone is used, the chances that the subjects forgot the mental processes they employed are greatly enhanced. In addition, the differences found may have been due to individual or group differences rather than task-related differences. There is little information in the report to support that the two groups were equivalent.

Powell (1988) conducted a study with nine proficient sixth-grade readers. All the subjects were observed, and they provided concurrent verbal reports as they were engaged in multiple-choice tests, cloze tests, written retellings, and a nonassessed reading task. The subjects gave retrospective verbal reports afterward. Twenty-one reading processes were identified from the verbal reports. The overall conclusions of this investigation indicated that the reading processes did differ as subjects were engaged in each of the tasks. The task which elicited behavior the most different from the other three was the cloze test. Subjects reported rereading and using context clues a great deal more on this task than on any of the others. They tied prior knowledge to the text and paraphrased the text a great deal less than in performing the other reading tasks.

The multiple-choice test and the written retellings,on the other hand, were very similar to each other and to the nonassessed reading task. The subjects reported tying prior knowledge in with the text, visualizing what was happening in the text, and paraphrasing the text almost with equal frequency across all three tasks. Therefore, within the limitations of the Powell study, it can be concluded that multiple-choice tests and written retellings had construct validity. While the scores (products) of these tests may not reveal direct information on the processes students use to complete them, the tasks do appear to involve mental processes that have long been associated with reading.

References

Afflerbach, Peter, and Johnston, Peter. "On the use of verbal reports in reading research," *Journal of Reading Behavior, 16* (4), 1984, pp. 307-322.

Alverman, Donne, and Ratekin, Ned. "Metacognitive knowledge about reading proficiency: Its relation to study strategies and task demands." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, 1982.

Aronson, Edith, and Farr, Roger. "Issues in assessment," *Journal of Reading*, 32 (2), November 1988, pp. 174-177.

Farr, Roger. "A response to Hoopfer and Hunsberger," *Forum in Reading and Language Education*, October 1986, pp. 129-133.

Farr, Roger, and Roser, Nancy. *Teaching a child to read.* New York: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, 1977.

Garner, Ruth. "Verbal-report data on reading strategies," *Journal of Reading Behavior, 14* (2), 1982, pp. 159-167.

Johnston, Peter. *Reading comprehension assessment: A cognitive basis.* Newark, Delaware: International Reading Association, 1983, 102 pp. [ED 226 338]

Johnston, Peter. "Assessing the process and the process of assessment in the language arts." In James Squire (Ed.), *The dynamics of language learning: Research in the language arts.* Urbana, Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English, 1986, 420 pp. [ED 280 080]

Meichenbaum, D.; Burland, S.; Gruson, L.; and Cameron, R. Metacognitive assessment. In S. R. Yussen (Ed.), *The growth of reflection in children.* Orlando: Academic Press, 1985.

Nisbett, Richard, and Wilson, Timothy. (1977). "Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes," *Psychological Review, 84* (3), 1977, pp. 231-259.

Powell, Janet L. "An examination of comprehension processes used by readers as they engage in different forms of assessment. "Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Indiana University, 1988. 196 pp. [ED 298 449]

Thorndike, Edward."Reading as reasoning: A study of mistakes in paragraph reading," *Reading Research Quarterly, 6* (4), 1971 [reprint of original 1917 article], pp. 425-434.

Wingenbach, Nancy (1984). "The gifted reader: Metacognition and comprehension strategies." Paper presented at the 3rd Annual Meeting of the National Council of Teachers of English, Spring Conference, 1984. 29pp. [ED 243 093]

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Reading and Communication Skills
Indiana University
Smith Research Center
2805 East Tenth Street, Suite 150
Bloomington, IN 47408
(812) 855-5847

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. R188062001. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

ERIC® CLEARINGHOUSE ON READING AND COMMUNICATION SKILLS

Number 6, 1988 DIGEST

Remedial Reading: Some caveats when applying two trends in diagnosis

by Roy Kress, Professor Emeritus, Temple University

Among the trends that have emerged in recent years to help diagnose the remedial reader are some which—applied with caution—may be of reasonable value to the clinician and the teacher. One of these trends has been the promotion of informal assessments, and an accompanying plethora of commercial informal reading inventories (IRIs). These instruments are designed to replace any that might be made by the teachers and clinicians who use them, and thus they should be examined carefully in terms of how well they serve teaching and clinical needs.

Customizing IRIs to minimize their limitations

Klesius and Homan (1985) responded to the emerging prominence of these instruments by suggesting ways that their reliability and validity could be improved by the teachers and clinicians using them. They recommended tape recording the student reading and his or her responses to questions so that they can be reviewed. In this way, all miscues can be identified and responses to comprehension questions can be carefully considered. Klesius and Homan recommended that items which could be answered without reading the passage be eliminated, that possible appropriate answers one's students give—but which are not listed in the inventory's directions—be added, and that questions which appear to be worded too awkwardly for the child being tested to grasp be reworded.

Klesius and Homan advised that only overall comprehension scores be used and that subskill scores based on just a few items should not be analyzed or used. They would place more emphasis on comprehension, however, than on miscue analysis and recommended watching for signs of frustration, no matter how well a student performs on the inventory.

It is highly impractical to expect either IRIs or "standard reading inventories" developed recently or even in the future to respond to *all* the many criticisms of reading tests, as Henk (1987) seems to think they can. But many IRI instruments now published do seem quite limited. Some assess only oral reading and miscue analysis, while the more comprehensive ones measure oral and silent reading comprehension and word recognition, both in isolation and in written context.

Only those IRIs accompanying basals tend to reflect the original concept of the IRI, which assesses a child's reading behavior in the materials actually used in his or her classroom instructional program. None provides the opportunity to observe how the reader goes about comprehending the information presented or how special textbook features, such as the table of contents, the glossary or index, pictorial material and graphs, a pronunciation guide, etc. are used.

The skills learned by the teacher in choosing the selections for an IRI and in constructing and revising the questions to be used are lost when published IRIs are used instead of teacher-designed instruments. The experience of constructing an IRI, which should be a part of preservice and inservice programs, trains teachers and clinicians alike to be more accurate observers of reading behavior.

Several studies reported in the ERIC database express concern about the inconsistent results yielded by published IRIs when they are compared to each other (Newcomer, 1985) or to standardized instruments such as the *Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty* (Nolen and Lam, 1981).

Using IRIs to select instructional materials

IRIs are frequently used to place readers in materials of appropriate difficulty, and thus readability issues are relevant to the use of the assessments. Some studies report that acting on the results of an IRI will lead to placement in reading materials that are significantly less difficult than those particular standardized tests would recommend. To some reading specialists, it is harmful to place children in unnecessarily low reading groups (Eldredge and Butterfield, 1984). Powell (1982) describes a method that responds to this concern. Teaching and diagnosis begin together with a lesson that develops motivation, background, vocabulary assistance, and purpose-setting for a particular text. Then the student reads the text aloud and the teacher records miscues for analysis. This procedure operates as a kind of IRI that identifies what Powell calls "the emergent reading level"—what the student can read *with instruction*.

Cadenhead (1987) suggests that gearing instruction to "reading levels" is relying on a myth that thwarts the challenge that more advanced material can evoke in children. Doing so, he contends, eliminates a "reasonable balance between success and challenge for the learner." While many of his arguments are quite valid for the achieving reader, they are inappropriate for the child who is a remedial reader and has experienced repeated doses of failure with printed material. Many experienced teachers and clinicians are aware of the need to follow the policy of identifying materials that will insure success when the remedial reader attempts to process text (e.g., Forell, 1985).

Some published IRIs include materials and strategies built into the diagnostic procedure, and these lead the teacher or clinician to use them with a problem reader before the result of the test can determine the inventory's specific recommendations for remediation. Some of these varied approaches are based on a contention that children will learn more readily when instruction is geared to model prefer-

---

Roy A. Kress is well known for his work in remedial reading. He is a member of the **Reading Hall of Fame**, *an honorary international organization of professionals who have made significant contributions to the field of reading and literacy.*

ences they may have. The seemingly logical assumption is reoccurring in the literature; but it appears to be as far from being substantiated as it was in 1972, when Robinson demonstrated that instructional emphases matching model preferences do not appear to improve learning.

Recognizing the limitations of computerized diagnosis

Another trend in reading diagnosis may limit the sensitivity of a clinician's or teacher's analysis of individual student needs. Accompanying many published diagnostic instruments are computer software programs that eliminate the need of the test administrator to truly examine the data. The computer can thus be used to analyze a student's performance and to produce several printout pages of the objective results, interpretations of them, and recommendations based on them—a service that must by necessity be based on some arbitrarily selected standards of performance—if not a norming procedure. Colbourn (1982) describes an early protocol of such a program developed by comparing diagnostic reports written by both humans and machines.

Evan at its best, such a computer analysis cannot match the essential benefits of an IRI—its ability to individualize the diagnosis of a reader. It should be obvious that computer scoring limits the opportunity of the clinician or teacher to become ever more sensitive to how particular signs of reading behavior relate to potentially effective remediation.

Many of the diagnostic instruments which provide computerized scoring, are themselves administered by computer. Branching computer software has the ability to offer a significantly larger number of packaged items individually to the student who finds a particular subskill difficult, increasing the reliability of that subscore. The information produced by such instruments would be of value as *a part of* the collection of data that clinicians and teachers consider in placement and other instructional decisions; it is difficult to see how they can ever become the single—or even major—informant of such decisions, however.

Incorporating computerized data into insightful clinical probing

Computerized diagnoses can now assess only the simplest aspects of comprehension, and that is almost invariably done with multiple-choice items. An in-depth assessment of comprehension can be made only through careful probing of the reader's understanding. This demands a face-to-face questioning situation. Such inventories cannot yet analyze miscues; nor can they analyze or evaluate responses to open-ended comprehension items. And certainly they cannot note the frustration or deliberation that Klesius and Homan argue is indicative of material that is too difficult even when students answer the accompanying questions correctly. The ability of these computer-driven instruments to diagnose the problems of individual readers is limited to analyses based on responses to a very fixed set of questions.

Teachers and clinicians need to make use of many tools to guide their decisions, and published diagnoses accompanied by computer software are among them. It is, nonetheless, important to remain aware that—at its best—diagnosis is a dynamic, insightful process, replete with delicate clinical probing of children's responses that cannot be replicated by a computer.

Precise assessment of a reader's strategies for handling printed material is in the realm of the trained diagnostician. It can be obtained only through careful observation of reading behavior and detailed analysis of the resultant understanding. A diagnostically oriented directed reading activity or the use of an individual informal reading inventory is a prerequisite.

References

Cadenhead, Kenneth. "Reading level: a metaphor that shapes practice," *Phi Delta Kappan, 68* (6), February 1987, pp. 436-441.

Colbourn, Marlene Jones. *Computer-guided Diagnosis of Learning Disabilities: A Prototype.* Master's Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Canada: 1982. 203pp. [ED 222 032]

Eldredge, J. Lloyd, and Butterfield, Dennie. "Sacred cows make good hamburger." A report on a reading research project titled "Testing the sacred cows in reading," 1984. 93pp. [ED 255 861]

Forell, Elizabeth R. "The case for conservative reader placement," *Reading Teacher, 38* (9), May 1985, pp. 857-862.

Henk, William A. "Reading assessments of the future: toward precision diagnosis," *Reading Teacher, 40* (9), May 1987, pp. 860-870.

Klesius, Janell P., and Homan, Susan P. "A validity and reliability update on the informal reading inventory with suggestions for improvement," *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 18* (2), February 1985, pp. 71-76.

Newcomer, Phyllis L. "A comparison of two published reading inventories," *Remedial and Special Education (RASE), 6* (1), January-February 1985, pp. 31-36.

Nolen, Patricia A., and Lam, Tony C. M. "A Comparison of IRI and *Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty* reading levels in clinical assessment," [1981].

Powell, William R. "The emergent reading level: a new concept." Paper presented at the Annual Southeastern Regional Conference of the International Reading Association, 1982. 17 pp. [ED 233 334]

Robinson, Helen M. "Visual and auditory modalities related to methods for beginning reading," *Reading Research Quarterly, 8* (1), Fall 1972, pp. 7-39.

ERIC Clearinghouse on
Reading and Communication Skills
Indiana University
Smith Research Center, Suite 150
2805 East Tenth Street
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698
(812) 855-5847

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. RI88062001. Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Task #1

Goal Statement

Your Name:_____

Course #:_____

Learning package:_____

The purpose of writing a goal statement is to create an expectation for yourself, to establish a purpose that you can check when you have finished reviewing the package of materials. It should be used in conjunction with your reaction statement--the commentary that you will make after working your way through the materials in the learning package.

Directions: This is a pre-reading activity. Think about the topic of this package and then look at the various materials, primarily reviewing their headlines and subheads. What does that review prompt you to want to discover through this package?

Write a goal statement of no more than one paragraph that includes the questions that you want answered or the kinds of applications that you hope the package will help you accomplish in your work. Attached please find examples of representative goal statements submitted by former students.

Mail a copy of your goal statement to your instructor. Please keep a copy for yourself because your reaction statement should be based partly on the goal statement.

My Goal Statement for this Package

Please mail a copy of this form to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Examples of Goal Statements

It is my expectation that this learning package will direct me in new directions so that I may improve my instruction in the area of vocabulary. I would like to know when it is best to introduce new vocabulary words. I would also like to gain information about new methods one might use when introducing new vocabulary. I expect to read about some of the newest research related to vocabulary instruction. It is also expected that tested methods will be described and examined. I would hope that these articles would help me improve how I teach so that my students will benefit and become better readers.

Following the study of this package, I expect to increase my understanding of computer usage in reading development, learn how to integrate computers into reading and writing instruction for learning impaired students, and make decisions on the usefulness of computer games in the classroom.

Following completion of this package I intend to:
1)Identify the components of a formal reading program evaluation.
2)Analyze the characteristics of an effective reading program.
3)Develop evaluation strategies that will improve the monitoring of my program objectives.

Task #2

Reaction Statement

You are asked to type a four-page reaction to this learning package as a way of firming up your sense of what you find interesting, important, or beneficial in this group of materials. You should construct this reaction with your previously established goal statement in mind.

Given below are a number of prompts to indicate the kinds of questions that you might wish to answer in developing this reaction. You may use other questions than those that are here listed. We anticipate that your reaction will be approximately four typewritten, double-spaced pages. Please use the following format in heading your paper.

Reaction

Your Name:_____

Course #:_____

Learning Package:_____

Reaction Prompts

1. Were your goals realized, and how do you know? (Refer to your goal statement.)

2. What important or beneficial ideas did you find in these materials? (Please cite the articles.)

3. Are there trends or concerns in the materials that bother you? Are there those that you agree with? Discuss. (Please use the annotated bibliography and cite ideas from it.)

4. What ideas did you want to try in your daily work world? Describe how you could apply these ideas?

Application Project

If you decide to use this topic for one of your two application projects, you may want to spend more time thinking about ways that you could explore one or more of these ideas in your work.

When you have finished your statement, please mail it to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Task #3

Application Project

As you select your two application projects, use the following guidelines:

1. **Formulate a question** that you would like to answer regarding this topic. (For example, can my slow readers use some of the self-monitoring strategies discussed in these materials?) A question often helps to clarify the kinds of information that you will collect or the kinds of evidence that you will use to convince a reader that you are pursuing an interesting question.

2. **Describe with as much detail** as is needed for a reader to understand what you did, what materials you used, what major procedures you used, what evidence you were looking for, in order to answer your question.

3. **Gather evidence** from your students or from teachers to show samples of the kinds of work or the kinds of interactions that were taking place. These samples may be your written observations, sample student papers, photographs, activity sheets, book titles, statistical data, or any other kind of evidence that demonstrates the reality of your inquiry.

4. **Write a summary** of your plan and of your conclusions. The summary should be coherent and clear so a person who was not on site can understand what you attempted and can appreciate the conclusions that you drew.

5. **Send a report** that includes a summary of your plan, sample evidence of what you found, a brief analysis of the evidence, and the conclusions that you

6. **Provide a cover page** that gives your name, address, course number, topic of learning package, and topic of your project. We will mail you a critique of your work. Send your report to:

   Carl B. Smith
   150 Smith Research Center
   Indiana University
   Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

Course Number_____ **Date**_____

Package Title_____

Statements	Strongly Agree	Agree	Uncertain	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
1. This package will help me do my job better.					
2. The pace of the package was too fast.					
3. The package's directions were confusing.					
4. It was easy to follow the directions given in the package.					
5. The package was too easy.					
6. The package was too long.					
7. The package should include more articles and documents to read.					
8. I didn't know the meaning of many words used in the package.					
9. The lecture explicated the topic of the package.					
10. The package's objectives were clear from the start.					
11. The package's teaching points were clear.					

What did you like best about the package?

What did you like least about the package?

How would you improve the package?

Please list other topics you would be interested in studying through our program.

Name (optional)_____

Position_____

Years Taught_____

Please mail a copy of this form to:

Carl B. Smith
150 Smith Research Center
Indiana University
Bloomington, IN 47408-2698

ERIC/RCS

Selected Abstracts from the ERIC Database

ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading & Communication Skills
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana
(812) 855-5847

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Sample ERIC Abstract

AN ED289160
AU Binkley,-Marilyn-R.; And-Others
TI Becoming a Nation of Readers: What Parents Can Do.
CS Heath (D.C.) and Co., Lexington, Mass,; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PY 1988
AV What Parents Can Do, Consumer Information Center, Pueblo, CO 81009 ($.50).
NT 40 p.; For Becoming a Nation of Readers: The Report of the Commission on Reading, see ED 253 865.
PR EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DE Beginning-Reading; Literacy-Education; Parent-Attitudes; Parent-Child-Relationship; Preschool-Children; Primary-Education; Reading-Aloud-to-Others; Reading-Attitudes; Recreational-Reading; Written-Language
DE *Literacy-; *Parent-Influence; *Parent-Participation; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Processes
ID Reading-Motivation
AB Intended for parents and based on the premise that parents are their children's first and most important teachers, this booklet is a distillation of findings from the 1984 report of the Commission on Reading, "Becoming a Nation of Readers." The introduction reiterates the Commission's conclusions (1) that a parent is a child's first tutor in unraveling the puzzle of written language; (2) that parents should read to preschool children and informally teach them about reading and writing; and (3) that parents should support school-aged children's continued growth as readers. Chapter 1 defines reading as the process of constructing meaning from written texts, a complex skill requiring the coordination of a number of interrelated sources of information. Chapter 2, on the preschool years, focuses on talking to the young child, reading aloud to the preschooler, and teaching children about written language. The third chapter, on beginning reading, counsels parents on what to look for in good beginning reading programs in schools, and how to help the child with reading at home. The fourth chapter, on developing readers and making reading an integral part of learning, offers suggestions for helping the child succeed in school and for encouraging reading for fun. The afterword calls on teachers, publishers, and school personnel, as well as parents, to participate actively in creating a literate society. The booklet concludes with a list of organizations that provide practical help or publications for parents.

Interpretation of ERIC Abstract Field Identifiers

AN ERIC accession number (Use this number when ordering microfiche and paper copies.)
AU Author(s)
TI Title
CS Corporate source
PY Actual or approximate publication date
AV Source and price (availability)
NT Pagination and additional information (such as legibility or related documents)
PR Indicates availability of document from the ERIC Document Reproduction Service
DE Descriptors-indexing terms from the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors* which indicate important concepts in the document
ID Identifiers-indexing terms not included in the *Thesaurus of ERIC Descriptors*
AB Summary

AN: ED235459
AU: Barr,-Rebecca
TI: A Sociological Approach to Classroom Instruction. Occasional Paper No. 6.
CS: National College of Education, Evanston, IL. Reading Center.
PY: 1983
NT: 18 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Basal-Reading; Classroom-Research; Classroom-Techniques; Comparative-Analysis; Difficulty-Level; Elementary-Education; Outcomes-of-Education; Reading-Ability; Reading-Achievement; Reading-Research; Textbook-Content
DE: *Classroom-Environment; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Materials; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Teaching-Methods; *Time-Factors-Learning
AB: To examine how classroom conditions such as students' mean aptitude, materials used, and instructional time influence the amount of reading material covered, 12 first grade classrooms were each observed for 12 days over a 36-week period. Students' reading readiness and word recognition skills were tested prior to observation while group mean aptitude, reading group size, and number of phonics concepts and new words introduced in the basal reading series were recorded during the study. Time spent on basal instruction, teacher-supervised reading group activities, and phonics work was determined by direct observation. Data corroborate earlier findings that the amount of material covered during a reading class--a significant predictor of reading achievement--was influenced by two main sets of conditions: characteristics of the group, particularly its mean aptitude, and conditions of the classroom, especially difficulty of materials and associated time conditions. (MM)

AN: ED255866
AU: Baumann,-James-F.
TI: The Systematic, Intensive Instruction of Reading Comprehension Skills.
PY: 1984
NT: 13 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (34th, St. Petersburg, FL, November 28-December 1, 1984).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Behavioral-Objectives; Independent-Study; Reading-Research; Reading-Skills; Secondary-Education; Teacher-Behavior; Teaching-Methods
DE: *Directed-Reading-Activity; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Strategies; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Teacher-Role
AB: In direct instruction, the teacher, in a face-to-face, reasonably formal manner, tells, shows, models, demonstrates, and

teaches the skill to be learned. Therefore, it is the teacher behavior aspect of classroom instruction that underpins the instructional strategy for teaching main ideas. Much has been learned about teacher behaviors that discriminate successful teachers from less successful teachers. Most of the teacher behaviors described in teacher effectiveness research cluster under the rubric "direct instruction." In a global sense, when direct instruction occurs, enough time is allocated to reading instruction, teachers accept responsibility for student achievement, and they expect that their students will learn. One direct instruction strategy for teaching students various reading comprehension skills is a five-step approach documented by the work and research of J. F. Baumann. The five steps consist of introduction, example, direct instruction, teacher directed application, and independent practice. That is, the teacher tells the students what the lesson will be about; the teacher provides an example; the teacher actually teaches the lesson; and then the teacher gradually releases responsibility for learning to the students through guided application exercises and by providing independent practice. (HOD)

AN: EJ306488
AU: Baumann,-James-F.
TI: Implications for Reading Instruction from the Research on Teacher and School Effectiveness.
PY: 1984
JN: Journal-of-Reading; v28 n2 p109-15 Nov 1984
AV: UMI
DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Leadership-; Planning-; Reading-Achievement; Success-; Teacher-Attitudes; Time-Management
DE: *Classroom-Environment; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teacher-Behavior; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Time-on-Task
AB: Describes the characteristics of effective reading programs and presents implications for the improvement of reading instruction. (HOD)

AN: EJ316561
AU: Bondy,-Elizabeth
TI: From Techniques to Process: Explorations beneath the Tip of the Iceberg.
PY: 1985
JN: Reading-World; v24 n3 p66-74 Mar 1985
AV: UMI
DE: Decision-Making; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Inservice-Teacher-Education; Teacher-Education; Teaching-Methods
DE: *Educational-Theories; *Information-Sources; *Reading-Instruction; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: Examines the nature of reading instruction across the United States, considers why problems exist, and suggests strategies for

improvement. Concludes that among the many sources of information that influence teachers' decisions about reading instruction, the least influential appears to be theoretical knowledge of the reading process. (FL)

AN: EJ274145
AU: Cheek,-Earl-H.; Cheek,-Martha-Collins
TI: Diagnostic-Prescriptive Reading Instruction: What? Why? How?
PY: 1983
JN: Reading-Horizons; v23 n2 p77-83 Win 1983
AV: Reprint: UMI
DE: Primary-Education; Reading-Materials; Reading-Skills; Teaching-Methods
DE: *Diagnostic-Teaching; *Reading-Diagnosis; *Reading-Instruction; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Teacher-Role
AB: Explains what diagnostic-prescriptive teaching is, how it should be used in the reading classroom, and how teachers can use it with classes of 30 students. (FL)

AN: ED219728
AU: Dorr-Bremme,-Donald-W.
TI: Higher Reading Achievement in Los Angeles Title I Elementary Schools: An Exploratory Study of Underlying Factors.
CS: California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.; Los Angeles Unified School District, Calif. Research and Evaluation Branch.
PY: 1981
AV: Center for the Study of Evaluation, 145 Moore Hall, University of California, Graduate School of Education, Los Angeles, CA 90024 ($5.00).
NT: 111 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DE: Educational-Attitudes; Educational-Practices; Educational-Research; Elementary-Education; Elementary-Schools; Reading-Achievement; Reading-Comprehension; Reading-Skills; Reading-Tests
DE: *Classroom-Observation-Techniques; *Educational-Environment; *Reading-Improvement; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: An exploratory study was carried out in four Los Angeles Title I elementary schools to determine what accounted for the comparatively high reading scores made by these schools' students on the Comprehensive Tests of Basic Skills; determine whether the schools were engaged in demonstrably effective educational practices that other Title I and similar schools could employ; and determine what those practices were and how they functioned to make a difference in students' reading. Using the framework of ethnographic studies, staff members and students were observed and listened to in a variety of settings: classrooms, labs and offices, the playground and the hallways, faculty meetings,

libraries, and lounges. In particular, 24 different classrooms were observed for a total of 10-12 school days. Analysis was aimed at identifying activities, environmental circumstances, beliefs and attitudes, materials, and organizational arrangements common to the four schools and functionally related to teaching/learning and/or test-taking in reading. Findings revealed seven conditions to be common to the four schools: (1) close attention to a continuum of reading skills, joined with a marked emphasis on reading for comprehension, (2) specialization of instruction in reading, (3) "strong" experienced teachers with high standards and expectations for student performance, (4) stability of the reading program and key staff members, (5) an emphasis on writing, (6) teacher participation in decision making, and (7) a high degree of both rapport and mutual respect among staff members. (HOD)

AN: ED227093
AU: Emans,-Robert
TI: Teaching Behaviors in Reading Instruction: A Review of the Research and Critique.
PY: 1983
NT: 49 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (Detroit, MI, February 24, 1983).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DE: Academic-Achievement; Educational-Research; Elementary-Education; Expectation-; Positive-Reinforcement; Questioning-Techniques; Student-Teacher-Relationship; Time-Factors-Learning
DE: *Classroom-Techniques; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teacher-Behavior; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: This paper summarizes research findings on teacher behavior and its relationship to student reading achievement. Research studies included in the review identified actual teaching behaviors, included observations of teacher-learner interactions, were limited to elementary school, and were conducted between 1966 and 1972. Subjects covered in the studies include: (1) instructional time and student achievement; (2) direct instruction; (3) classroom climate and teacher management; (4) teacher praise and criticism; (5) teacher expectations; (6) teachers' use of questions; (7) specialized subject matter teaching behaviors; and (8) changing teacher behavior through interactive inservice programs. A discussion is presented on the research methodology used in these studies, the general reliability of research findings, and significant and recurring findings brought forward by this review. A list of 126 references is included. (JD)

AN: ED250653
AU: Engelmann,-Siegfried; Meyer,-Linda-A.

TI: Reading Comprehension Instruction in Grades 4, 5, and 6: Program Characteristics; Teacher Perceptions; Teacher Behaviors; and Student Performance.
CS: Engelmann-Becker Corp., Eugene, OR.
PY: 1984
NT: 35 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (68th, New Orleans, LA, April 23-27, 1984). For a related document, see CS 007 722.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DE: Academic-Achievement; Classroom-Research; Comparative-Analysis; Content-Analysis; Intermediate-Grades; Reading-Achievement; Reading-Research; Teacher-Attitudes; Teaching-Methods; Textbooks-
DE: *Basal-Reading; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Materials; *Teacher-Behavior; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: A three-part study was conducted to present an indepth look at reading comprehension instruction in the middle grades. In the first part of the study, four basal series for grades 4, 5, and 6, were analyzed for clarity of communication, adequacy of skill practice provided, and a number of other comprehension related dimensions. In the second part, 17 teachers were videotaped as they taught two comprehension topic areas and were interviewed to get their perceptions of the texts they used and of their students' mastery of the material taught. These results were compared with those obtained from a larger sample of teachers who completed questionnaires. The third part of the study examined student achievement for the observed teachers on criterion-referenced tests designed to assess what was taught. Overall results indicated that (1) the text presentations were inadequate in terms of their instructional design features, (2) the teachers did not improve upon the texts, (3) teacher perceptions of how well they taught and how much their students learned were inaccurate, and (4) only 55% of the students learned 50% of the comprehension skills presented. (FL)

AN: ED241903
AU: Gibbs,-Vanita-M., Comp.; And-Others
TI: Reading: The Core of Learning. Proceedings of the Annual Reading Conference (13th, Terre Haute, Indiana, June 16-17, 1983).
CS: Indiana State Univ., Terre Haute. Curriculum Research and Development Center.
PY: 1984
AV: Curriculum Research and Development Center, Statesman Towers West, School of Education, Indiana State University, Terre Haute, IN 47809.
NT: 60 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DE: Computer-Assisted-Instruction; Computer-Software; Creative-Writing; Elementary-Education; Kindergarten-; Microcomputers-; Poetry-; Reading-Research; Reading-Skills;

Remedial-Reading; Semantics-; Student-Teacher-Relationship; Teaching-Methods; Theories-; Writing-Exercises
DE: *Motivation-Techniques; *Reading-Improvement; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Strategies; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: Reflecting the views of teachers, reading specialists, and professors on both the basics and the new technologies in reading instruction, these conference proceedings begin with Carl Personke's address, "The Word's the Thing," on classroom activities that stress the word as concept. The second paper, William Linville's and David Waterman's "Now That You Have a Microcomputer," discusses computer programs in reading and lists companies offering computer catalogs, while the third, "Writing for Reading: Listening to the Flip Side," by Catherine Baker, examines the cause/effect relationship between reading and writing. In the fourth paper, "Reading Poetry: Back to Basics," James Mullican suggests why poetry is basic to human culture and offers strategies for involving children with poetry. The fifth paper, Robert Arnett's "Sans Scintillating Salesmanship Skills, Reading Centers Sag," describes how to convince administrators and students of the importance of reading programs and reading, and the sixth paper, "Listen to My Ideas and I Will Read: A Case for Kindergarten Experiences," by Jan McCarthy, examines the teacher's impact on student learning. Carl Personke's closing address, "Wherein We'll Catch the King," investigates schema theory and reading. (MM)

AN: ED252823
AU: Gutknecht,-Bruce
TI: Goal: Excellence in Preparation for Teaching Reading.
PY: 1984
NT: 8 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Florida Reading Association (22nd, Jacksonville, FL, October 18-21, 1984).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Educational-Assessment; Educational-Improvement; Educational-Needs; Educational-Objectives; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Program-Content
DE: *Educational-Quality; *Program-Improvement; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Teachers; *Teacher-Education-Programs; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: If lack of excellence in the public schools is a problem, it does not follow naturally that teachers and their preparation are the only elements in society at fault. However, it may be that teachers and teacher preparation have not kept pace with societal changes and expectations. To most students it appears that the purpose of education is to enable them to score well on standardized tests. And, teachers, school administrators, school boards, parents, and state legislators seem to believe the myth that good test scores and educational quality are synonymous. In the area of reading instruction, the only real goal should be to help students understand or comprehend the message of the writer.

The reading teacher must be more than a skill-driver; he or she must develop a working knowledge of the major theoretical bases on which sound reading instruction can be built. Therefore, a quality teacher education program in reading should include such attributes as established entrance criteria, performance-based curricula, early and frequent field experiences, computation and communication skills measurement, the requirement of an academic major for secondary education majors, and clinical experience supervised by college faculty with classroom teaching experience using an established teaching performance measurement system. Programs that do not measure up to these criteria need modification leading to improved quality. The only result of such activity can be excellence in preparation for teaching reading. (HOD)

AN: EJ294727
AU: Guzzetti,-Barbara-J.; Marzano,-Robert-J.
TI: Correlates of Effective Reading Instruction.
PY: 1984
JN: Reading-Teacher; v37 n8 p754-58 Apr 1984
AV: UMI
DE: Elementary-Education; Reading-Achievement; Success-; Teaching-Methods
DE: *Institutional-Characteristics; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *School-Effectiveness; *Teacher-Characteristics; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: Notes that school effectiveness research has identified particular process and content characteristics associated with gains in reading achievement. Examines the research and the application of research findings. (FL)

AN: ED265504
AU: Hoffman,-James-V., Ed.
TI: Effective Teaching of Reading: Research and Practice.
CS: International Reading Association, Newark, Del.
PY: 1986
AV: International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Rd., PO Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714-8139 (Book No. 739, $11.00 member, $16.50 nonmember).
NT: 315 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC13 Plus Postage.
DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Models-; Program-Effectiveness; Reading-Improvement; Reading-Processes; Reading-Programs; Reading-Strategies; Reading-Teachers; Remedial-Reading; Time-Management
DE: *Classroom-Techniques; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Teaching-Methods
AB: Distilling and interpreting past and current research on the effective teaching of reading is the focus of this volume. The titles and authors are as follows: "Research in Effective

Teaching: An Overview of Its Development" (William H. Rupley, Beth S. Wise, and John W. Logan); "Process-Product Research on Effective Teaching: A Primer for a Paradigm" (James V. Hoffman); "Principles for Conducting First Grade Reading Group Instruction" (Jere Brophy); "Effective Use of Time in Secondary Reading Programs" (Jane A. Stallings); "Case Study of a Changing Reading Program and the Role of Teacher Effectiveness Research" (Mark W. F. Condon and Marilyn B. Kapel); "Effective Use of Instructional Time: The Cupertino Project" (Martha Rapp Haggard and Jennifer Reese Better); "Changing Teacher Practice: A Research Based School Improvement Study (Gary A. Griffin and Susan Barnes); "Instructional Decision Making and Reading Teacher Effectiveness" (Gerald G. Duffy and Deborah L. Ball); "Studying Qualitative Dimensions of Instructional Effectiveness" (Laura R. Roehler and Gerald G. Duffy); "Project READ: An Inservice Model for Training Classroom Teachers in Effective Reading Instruction" (Robert Calfee and Marcia K. Henry); "The Madeline Hunter Model of Teacher Effectiveness" (Renee Weisberg); "Policy Constraints and Effective Compensatory Reading Instruction: A Review" (Richard L. Allington); and "What We Know and What We Need to Learn About Reading Instruction" (Rebecca Barr). (EL)

AN: EJ342441
AU: Johns,-Jerry
TI: Ingredients for a Sound Reading Program.
PY: 1986
JN: Australian-Journal-of-Reading; v9 n1 p3-10 Mar 1986
DE: Elementary-Secondary-Education; Learning-Theories; Reading-Strategies
DE: *Program-Content; *Program-Effectiveness; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Programs; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Teacher-Role
AB: Argues that sound reading programs require teachers to act on their understanding that reading is a meaning making process. Offers six interrelated principles about reading. (FL)

AN: EJ341178
AU: Lapointe,-Archie
TI: The State of Instruction in Reading and Writing in U.S. Elementary Schools.
PY: 1986
JN: Phi-Delta-Kappan; v68 n2 p135-38 Oct 1986
AV: UMI
DE: Elementary-Education; Minority-Group-Children; Young-Children
DE: *Academic-Achievement; *Reading-Instruction; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Writing-Instruction
AB: Summarizes 15 years of National Assessment of Educational Progress data on reading and writing in elementary schools. While reading performance has improved over the 1971-1984 period for black and Hispanic 9- and 13-year-olds and for younger

disadvantaged children, writing results are less encouraging. Effective writing instruction may require more than variety and hard work. (MLH)

AN: ED266424
AU: Linn,-Robert-L.; Meyer,-Linda-A.
TI: Kindergarten Instruction and Early Reading Achievement. Technical Report No. L-4.
CS: Bolt, Beranek and Newman, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.; Illinois Univ., Urbana. Center for the Study of Reading.
PY: 1985
NT: 27 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (34th, St. Petersburg, FL, November 28-December 1, 1984). Figure 3 contains small print.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DE: Kindergarten-; Primary-Education; Reading-Skills; Reading-Strategies; Teacher-Behavior; Teacher-Influence; Teaching-Methods; Teaching-Styles
DE: *Feedback-; *Reading-Achievement; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Time-on-Task
AB: The relationship of the amount of classroom time devoted to reading instruction, the number of reading related activities, and teacher instruction feedback to reading achievement at the end of kindergarten was investigated for a sample of approximately 300 children in 14 kindergarten classrooms at three schools. Based on nine rounds of full-day observations, it was found that there are great between- and within-class differences in the amount and type of reading instruction received by the kindergarten children. These differences were strongly related to student decoding ability in the spring after controlling for fall achievement. Future analyses of the continuing longitudinal follow-up of these children will investigate the degree to which these differences in early reading achievement are reflected in later reading comprehension differences. (Tables of findings are included.) (Author/EL)

AN: ED261999
AU: Magliaro,-Susan-G.; Borko,-Hilda
TI: A Naturalistic Investigation of Experienced Teachers' and Student Teachers' Instructional Practices.
PY: 1985
NT: 30 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (69th, Chicago, IL, March 31-April 4, 1985).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DE: Classroom-Techniques; Naturalistic-Observation; Student-Behavior
DE: *Academic-Achievement; *Reading-Instruction; *Student-Teachers; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Teaching-Experience; *Teaching-Styles

AB: This study examined the relationships among reading activities, rules for pupil participation, student engagement, and subsequent student achievement in reading lessons taught by student teachers (ST) and experienced teachers (ET). Two ST/ET dyads were observed and interviewed while they instructed third and fourth grade pupils in reading. The teachers in one dyad had similar participation structures: however, their subsequent student engagement and student achievement were different. While the participation structures of the second dyad differed, student engagement and achievement were alike. The contrasts between dyads indicated different levels of ability between the two student teachers. The differential effectiveness of the student teachers suggests that several factors may play important, interrelated roles in determining the success of novice teachers' reading instruction. The difference between these student teachers seemed to be explained best by their conceptions of their roles as student teachers, and the influence these conceptions had on their choice of participation structures and reading activities and their ability to implement these choices. These differences suggest that student teachers progress at different rates in the process of learning to teach. (JD)

AN: ED267386
AU: Merritt,-John-E.
TI: Reading and Information Skills--A Functional Approach.
PY: 1985
NT: 15 p.; Paper presented at the SEAMEO Regional Language Seminar "Language across the Curriculum" (Singapore, April 22-26, 1985).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Reading-Skills; Reading-Tests
DE: *Functional-Reading; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: The study of reading in restricted contexts ultimately short changes children. The continuous proliferation of research data results in teacher training courses that are overloaded with marginally relevant material. A vast number of "teachable skills" are isolated, and well-meaning publishers produce sophisticated but unnecessary materials; moreover, teachers and students waste valuable curriculum time on unnecessary or counter-productive activities. Evidence for these problems can be seen in international comparisons of attainment in countries that spend their resources in different ways, in studies comparing the efficacy of different teaching strategies, in the comparison of reading in school and the reading needed in everyday life. and in studies of the actual effects of efforts in schools in relation to the standards needed for literate survival. Standardized tests of reading based on materials used in teaching cannot indicate whether teachers' efforts are related to reality or anything about functional reading. Only when practical links between the work of the school and the everyday life of the community are

forged, will an adequate curriculum for reading development be provided. (EL)

AN: EJ381816
AU: Nicholson,-Tom
TI: Using the CIPP Model to Evaluate Reading Instruction.
PY: 1989
JN: Journal-of-Reading; v32 n4 p312-18 Jan 1989
AV: UMI
DE: Case-Studies; Individualized-Instruction; Student-Evaluation
DE: *Evaluation-Methods; *Instructional-Effectiveness; *Reading-Instruction
AB: Presents an approach to evaluation of reading instruction called CIPP (context, input, process, product), including: methods for discovering the needs of each student, getting input from students and colleagues concerning possible action, implementing evaluation in the process of instruction, and then carrying out an evaluation of the final product. (RS)

AN: EJ288031
AU: Reutzel,-D.-Ray
TI: Interviewing: How to Hire a Good Classroom Teacher of Reading.
PY: 1983
JN: Reading-Teacher; v37 n2 p122-27 Nov 1983
AV: UMI
DE: Elementary-Education; Job-Applicants; Program-Improvement
DE: *Administrator-Role; *Employment-Interviews; *Questioning-Techniques; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Teachers; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: Argues that to improve a reading program, administrators need to hire teachers who know what's involved in good reading instruction. Provides a sample interview of a prospective teacher and a list of useful interview questions, all based on research into what makes reading instruction effective. (FL)

AN: EJ353682
AU: Reutzel,-D.-Ray; Daines,-Delva
TI: The Instructional Coherence of Reading Lessons in Seven Basal Reader Series.
PY: 1987
JN: Reading-Psychology; v8 n1 p33-47 1987
AV: UMI
DE: Coherence-; Connected-Discourse; Elementary-Education; Instructional-Materials; Reading-Materials; Reading-Research
DE: *Basal-Reading; *Instructional-Effectiveness; *Reading-Assignments; *Reading-Comprehension; *Reading-Instruction
AB: Indicates that each instructional unit was composed of

several mini-lessons rather than representing an integrated and related unit organized around a central purpose. Finds that lesson parts failed to make logical connections to previous or following parts. Concludes that the nature of reading lessons could be a contributing factor to the instructional "flitting" observed in previous classroom observational studies. (NKA)

AN: EJ322087
AU: Roberts,-Tessa
TI: Organizing Reading in the Primary Classroom.
PY: 1985
JN: Reading; v19 n2 p93-99 Jul 1985
DE: Learning-Strategies; Primary-Education; Reading-Achievement; Reading-Games; Reading-Improvement; Reading-Research; Teaching-Methods
DE: *Beginning-Reading; *Class-Organization; *Classroom-Techniques; *Reading-Instruction; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: Offers suggestions for organizing the primary classroom to provide ideal conditions for teaching reading. (DF)

AN: EJ345143
AU: Rupley,-William-H.; Blair,-Timothy-R.
TI: Assignment and Supervision of Reading Seatwork: Looking in on 12 Primary Teachers.
PY: 1987
JN: Reading-Teacher; v40 n4 p391-93 Jan 1987
AV: UMI
DE: Learning-Strategies; Primary-Education
DE: *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Teacher-Role; *Teaching-Methods; *Theory-Practice-Relationship
AB: Compares the literature on teacher effectiveness with observations of 12 primary grade teachers, noting areas where teachers may be missing opportunities to make seatwork more effective. (FL)

AN: ED222863
AU: Sadoski,-Mark-C.
TI: SSR, Accountability and Effective Reading Instruction. Technical Paper Number R82001.
CS: Texas A and M Univ., College Station. Coll. of Education.
PY: 1982
NT: 9 p.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Affective-Objectives; Cognitive-Objectives; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Enrichment-Activities; Evaluation-Criteria; Instructional-Improvement; Program-Effectiveness

DE: *Accountability-; *Reading-Instruction;
*Sustained-Silent-Reading; *Teacher-Effectiveness;
*Teaching-Methods
AB: Sustained silent reading (SSR) is intended to promote reading growth through allowing students to have sustained encounters with self-selected reading material without interruption in the presence of positive peer and teacher role models. Recent research suggests that SSR is of significant value when combined with a regular program of reading. Educational accountability in reading instruction is usually determined from test results. It should, however, address both the cognitive and affective development of readers. Considering the two major variables of content covered and academically engaged minutes, open and closed teaching models seem to stress one or the other of the two areas of development. Although a supplementary activity that cannot replace reading instruction itself, SSR bridges the gap between learning outcomes associated with cognitive reading achievement and affective reading achievement. As such it addresses the concerns of accountability with a single investment of time and without compromises and trade-offs. Although SSR isn't always workable on a schoolwide basis, its strengths and features make it deserving of consideration from reading specialists, classroom teachers, and administrators responsible for accountability and effective reading instruction. (JL)

AN: EJ306491
AU: Shannon,-Albert-J.
TI: Monitoring Reading Instruction in the Content Areas.
PY: 1984
JN: Journal-of-Reading; v28 n2 p128-34 Nov 1984
AV: UMI
DE: Reading-Ability; Reading-Skills; Secondary-Education;
Teacher-Behavior
DE: *Content-Area-Reading; *Guidelines-; *Measurement-Techniques;
*Reading-Instruction; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: Proposes an instrument that should help teachers and administrators monitor instructional reading practices and abilities in the content area classroom. (HOD)

AN: EJ370914
AU: Silvern,-Steven-B., Ed.; And-Others
TI: Reviews of Research. Effective Schools Research and
Excellence in Reading: A Rationale for Children's Literature in
the Curriculum.
PY: 1988
JN: Childhood-Education; v64 n4 p235-36,38,40-1 Apr 1988
AV: UMI
DE: Elementary-Education; Reading-Research; Teaching-Methods
DE: *Books-; *Childrens-Literature; *Reading-Instruction;
*Reading-Material-Selection; *Teacher-Effectiveness

AB: Examines the findings of effective schools research and reading research that support the view that (1) more time should be devoted to reading children's literature and (2) more than basal materials is necessary for effective instruction. Shows how teaching children's literature can improve teacher effectiveness. (SKC)

AN: ED230929
TI: Teacher Characteristics and Teacher Education in Reading and English Language Arts Instruction: Abstracts of Doctoral Dissertations Published in "Dissertation Abstracts International," January through June 1983 (Vol. 43 Nos. 7 through 12).
CS: ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills, Urbana, Ill.
PY: 1983
NT: 10 p.; Pages may be marginally legible.
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Annotated-Bibliographies; Decision-Making; Doctoral-Dissertations; Elementary-Secondary-Education; Higher-Education; Language-Arts; Reading-Programs; Reading-Teachers; Remedial-Reading; Student-Teacher-Relationship; Teacher-Behavior; Teacher-Role
DE: *Administrator-Role; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teacher-Characteristics; *Teacher-Education; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: This collection of abstracts is part of a continuing series providing information on recent doctoral dissertations. The 16 titles deal with a variety of topics, including the following: (1) the relationship between selected teacher personality traits and the teaching behaviors of remedial reading teachers; (2) reading program problems of beginning elementary school teachers and their sources of help; (3) reading educators' and content educators' views on key objectives of content-related reading education; (4) the effects of the reading resource teacher as perceived by the classroom teacher; (5) perceptions of principals' leadership behaviors related to the reading programs in elementary schools with high and low student achievement; (6) the impact of language differences on oral reading analysis; (7) communications styles and their relationship to evaluations between teacher and students; (8) communicative dimensions of teaching effectiveness; (9) individual teacher differences, predictions, and questioning strategies and student responses during reading lessons; (10) job descriptions for reading specialists in selected school districts in the United States; and (11) intermediate grade teachers' instructional decision making in reading. (FL)

AN: ED302838
AU: Wendler,-David; And-Others

TI: Comprehension Instruction of Award Winning Teachers, Masters Degree Teachers and Non-Masters Degree Teachers.
PY: 1988
NT: 59 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Reading Conference (38th, Tucson, AZ, November 29-December 3, 1988).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DE: Analysis-of-Variance; Educational-Research; Elementary-Education; Elementary-School-Teachers; Public-School-Teachers; Reading-Instruction; Teacher-Attitudes; Time-Management
DE: *Reading-Comprehension; *Teacher-Effectiveness; *Teaching-Methods
AB: A study examined time spent on comprehension instruction by award winning, masters degree, and non-masters degree teachers. Observations of reading lessons were made under two conditions; not-cued and cued to teach "ideal" comprehension instruction lessons. Subjects were 36 public school third-, fourth-, fifth-, and sixth-grade teachers teaching in 20 different schools located in 12 different public school districts of a midwestern state. Results were analyzed using a one between, one within analysis of variance with repeated measures on one factor with respect to percentage of time spent on prereading activities, comprehension instruction, and all comprehension activities. Results showed there were no significant differences among the award winning, masters degree, and non-masters degree teachers in the percentage of time spent on pre-reading activities or on comprehension instruction. Award winning teachers did allocate significantly more time than non-masters degree teachers to making assignments and to giving individual help with those assignments. When told that comprehension instruction was the purpose of observations, teachers did not increase the percentage of time for prereading activities or comprehension instruction. Instead they significantly increased the percentage of time spent asking assessment questions, listening to students' answers, and giving corrective feedback. (Eight tables of data, 2 appendixes of categories and definitions of Reading Activities and Teacher Behaviors, and 38 references are attached.) (Author/RAE)

AN: EJ383268
AU: Wilkinson,-Ian; And-Others
TI: Silent Reading Reconsidered: Reinterpreting Reading Instruction and Its Effects.
PY: 1988
JN: American-Educational-Research-Journal; v25 n1 p127-44 Spr 1988
AV: UMI
DE: Children-; Elementary-Education; Reading-Achievement; Reading-Research
DE: *Elementary-School-Students; *Instructional-Effectiveness; *Learning-Disabilities; *Reading-Instruction; *Silent-Reading

AB: Data from a study on silent classroom reading with 105 learning disabled students (aged 6-12 years) are reanalyzed using linear structural equation modeling. It appears that, when entry-level abilities are controlled, silent reading did not have a significant effect on posttest reading performance. (TJH)

AN: ED240530
AU: Wise,-Beth-S.; Shaver,-Judy-C.
TI: Effectiveness Training for Elementary Teachers of Reading.
PY: 1983
NT: 12 p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Reading Forum (4th, Sarasota, FL, December 8-10, 1983).
PR: EDRS Price - MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DE: Correlation-; Elementary-Education; Feedback-; Pretests-Posttests; Questioning-Techniques; Reading-Achievement; Reading-Improvement; Teacher-Improvement; Teaching-Methods
DE: *Elementary-School-Teachers; *Reading-Instruction; *Reading-Research; *Teacher-Education; *Teacher-Effectiveness
AB: A study investigated the effect of research-based instructional strategies on the reading achievement of students in grades two through five. Instructional process variables were assembled into a manual used to train 24 experimental teachers. The five categories of variables were (1) classroom environment, (2) lesson introduction, (3) lesson presentation, (4) questioning, and (5) feedback. The teachers were randomly assigned, stratified by grade level, to observed or unobserved experimental groups or to a control group. The experimental treatment was designed to enhance teachers' use of reading instructional strategies associated with reading achievement. Pupils were pretested and posttested with the McGraw-Hill Prescriptive Reading Inventory. Observational data gathered on teachers' use of instructional process variables were correlated with adjusted pupil reading achievement scores to specify the strengths of associations between the two. No significant differences were found among treatment and control groups, so data were examined for differences among teachers. Significant positive correlations for "more effective" teachers were found between pupils' total reading achievement and the instructional process variables of engaging students in learning and asking direct questions. Significant negative correlations were found between achievement and the instructional variables of asking rhetorical questions and giving nonacademic commands. (HTH)

GETTING COPIES OF THE ITEMS DESCRIBED IN THE ERIC DATABASE:

The items described in the ERIC database have either an "ED" or an "EJ" number in the first field. **About 98% of the ED items can be found in the ERIC Microfiche Collection.** The ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS) in Alexandria, Virginia can produce either microfiche or paper copies of these documents for you. Check the accompanying list of **ERIC Price Codes** for their current prices.

Alternatively, you may prefer to consult the ERIC Microfiche Collection yourself before choosing documents to copy. Over 600 libraries in the United States subscribe to this collection. To find out which libraries near you have it, you are welcome to call the ERIC Clearinghouse on Reading and Communication Skills at (812) 855-5847. Most such libraries have equipment on site for inexpensive production of paper copies from the fiche.

For those few ED-numbered items not found in the Microfiche Collection, check the availability (AV) field of the citation to get information about the author, publisher, or other distributor.

Items with an EJ number in the first field of the citation are journal articles. Due to copyright restrictions, ERIC cannot provide copies of these articles. Most large college or university libraries subscribe to the journals in which these articles were published, and the general public can read or copy the articles from their collections. Should you want copies of articles which appeared in journals not owned by your nearest university library, arrangements usually can be made via interlibrary loan; there frequently is a nominal charge for this, which is set by the lending library. If you are a faculty member, staff member, or student at the university, just ask at your library's reference desk.

For all other categories of users, most universities cannot provide interlibrary services. However, public libraries---which are there to serve all area residents---typically are hooked into statewide lending networks designed to ensure that all state residents have access to materials of interest. Ask your local public librarian about interlibrary loan policies, charges, etc.

There are also two professional reprint services which have obtained permission from some journals to sell article copies. These are University Microfilms International (Article Clearinghouse, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106---(800) 732-0616), and the Institute for Scientific Information (Original Article Tear Sheet Service, 3501 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104---(800) 523-1850). At the time of this publication, UMI charged $10.75 per article regardless of length, and ISI charged $9.50 for the first ten pages, plus $2.00 for each additional ten pages or fraction thereof. However, please check with them for current prices before ordering.

ERIC Price Codes

PAPER COPY /HARD COPY

PRICE CODE	PAGINATION	PRICE
PC 01	1- 25	$ 2.03
PC 02	26- 50	4.06
PC 03	51- 75	6.09
PC 04	76- 100	8.12
PC 05	101- 125	10.15
PC 06	126- 150	12.18
PC 07	151- 175	14.21
PC 08	176- 200	16.24
PC 09	201- 225	18.27
PC 10	226- 250	20.30
PC 11	251- 275	22.33
PC 12	276- 300	24.36
PC 13	301- 325	26.39
PC 14	326- 350	28.42
PC 15	351- 375	30.45
PC 16	376- 400	32.48
PC 17	401- 425	34.51
PC 18	426- 450	36.54
PC 19	451- 475	38.57
PC 20	476- 500	40.60
PC 21	501- 525	42.63
PC 22	526- 550	44.66
PC 23	551- 575	46.69
PC 24	576- 600	48.72
PC 25	601- 625	50.75
PC 26	626- 650	52.78
PC 27	651- 675	54.81
PC 28	676- 700	56.84
PC 29	701- 725	58.87
PC 30	726- 750	60.90
PC 31	751- 775	62.93
PC 32	776- 800	64.96
PC 33	801- 825	66.99
PC 34	826- 850	69.02
PC 35	851- 875	71.05
PC 36	876- 900	73.08
PC 37	901- 925	75.11
PC 38	926- 950	77.14
PC 39	951- 975	79.17
PC 40	976-1,000	81.20

ADD 2.03 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL 25 PAGES,
OR FRACTION THEREOF

MICROFICHE

PRICE CODE	PAGINATION	NO. OF FICHE	PRICE
MF 01	1- 480	1-5	$ .86
MF 02	481- 576	6	1.03
MF 03	577- 672	7	1.20
MF 04	673- 768	8	1.37
MF 05	769- 864	9	1.54
MF 06	865- 960	10	1.71
MF 07	961-1,056	11	1.88
MF 08	1,057-1,152	12	2.05
MF 09	1,153-1,248	13	2.22
MF 10	1,249-1,344	14	2.39
MF 11	1,345-1,440	15	2.56
MF 12	1,441-1,536	16	2.73
MF 13	1,537-1,632	17	2.90
MF 14	1,633-1,728	18	3.07
MF 15	1,729-1,824	19	3.24

ADD $0.17 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL MICROFICHE
(1-96 PAGES)

HOW TO ORDER ERIC DOCUMENTS

EDRS **ERIC®** **DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE**

7420 FULLERTON ROAD, SUITE 110
SPRINGFIELD, VA 22153-2852

OPERATED BY

CINCINNATI BELL INFORMATION SYSTEMS (CBIS) FEDERAL
800-443-3742 703-440-1400

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS TO COMPLETE THIS ORDER FORM

- Order by 6 digit ED number
- Enter unit price
- Specify either Microfiche (MF) or Paper Copy (PC)
- Include shipping charges

ED NUMBER	NO. OF PAGES	NO. OF COPIES MF	NO. OF COPIES PC	UNIT PRICE	TOTAL UNIT COST
TOTAL NO. OF PAGES				SUBTOTAL	
UNIT PRICE SCHEDULE				RESIDENTS OF VA, MD AND DC - ADD APPLICABLE SALES TAX	
				SHIPPING CHARGES	
				TOTAL COST	

MICROFICHE (MF)

NUMBER FICHE EACH ED #	PRICE CODE	Price
1 to 5 (up to 480 pages)	MF01	$1.18
Each additional microfiche (additional 96 pages)		$ .25

PAPER COPY (PC)

NUMBER PAGES EACH ED #	PRICE CODE	Price
1 to 25	PC01	$3.12
Each additional 25 pages		$3.12

CHARTS FOR DETERMINING SHIPPING CHARGES

U.S. POSTAL SERVICE 1st CLASS POSTAGE FOR					MICROFICHE ONLY	
1-7 Microfiche ONLY $0.29	8-19 Microfiche ONLY $0.52	20-30 Microfiche ONLY $0.75	31-42 Microfiche ONLY $0.98	43-54 Microfiche ONLY $1.21	55-67 Microfiche ONLY $1.44	68-80 Microfiche ONLY $1.67

UNITED PARCEL SERVICE CHARGES FOR CONTINENTAL U.S. SHIPMENTS ONLY*

*UPS will not deliver to a P.O. Box Number. A Street Address must be provided.

1 lb. 81-160 MF or 1-75 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $2.79	2 lbs. 161-330 MF or 76-150 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $3.30	3 lbs. 331-500 MF or 151-225 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $3.74	4 lbs. 501-670 MF or 226-300 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $4.09	5 lbs. 671-840 MF or 301-375 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $4.31	6 lbs. 841-1010 MF or 376-450 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $4.53	7 lbs. 1011-1180 MF or 451-525 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $4.77	8 to 10 lbs. 1181-1690 MF 526-750 PC PAGES Not to Exceed $5.17-$5.94

NOTE—Orders for 81 or more microfiche and all orders for paper copies (PC) will be shipped via United Parcel Service unless otherwise instructed.

SEE REVERSE FOR EXPEDITED DOCUMENT DELIVERY SERVICE

PAYMENTS: You may pay by

1. Enclosing CHECK or MONEY ORDER with your order. Foreign customer checks must be drawn on a U.S. bank.
2. Charge to a MasterCard or VISA account. Enter account number, card expiration date and signature. (EDRS also accepts telephone orders when charged to a MasterCard or VISA account.)
3. PURCHASE ORDERS: U.S. customers may enclose an authorized original purchase order. No purchase orders are accepted from foreign customers.
4. Charge to a DEPOSIT ACCOUNT. Enter deposit account number and sign order form.

PLEASE INDICATE METHOD OF PAYMENT AND ENTER REQUIRED INFORMATION.

WE HONOR BOTH

☐ Check or Money Order ☐ Purchase Order (ATTACH ORIGINAL PURCHASE ORDER)

☐ MasterCard ☐ VISA

Account Number _____ Expiration Date _____

Signature _____

☐ Deposit Account Number _____

Signature _____

ENTER "SHIP TO" ADDRESS _____

_____

_____

CALL TOLL FREE 1-800-443-ERIC (3742) 24 HOURS A DAY - 7 DAYS A WEEK
ALLOW 5 WORKING DAYS FOR EDRS TO PROCESS AND SHIP YOUR ORDER

EXPEDITED DOCUMENT DELIVERY

Expedited delivery of ERIC documents is available.

- Call in your order 24 hours a day toll free 1-800-443-ERIC (3742).
- Fax your order 24 hours a day 703-440-1408.

Your order will be shipped to you, by the method you select, on the fifth (5th) working day after receipt.

To insure expedited receipt, request shipment by either:

- USPS Express Mail
- UPS Next Day Air
- Federal Express
- FAX transmission of your document

Shipping and FAX transmission charges will be added to the cost of the document(s) by EDRS.

These requesting and delivery methods are in addition to the 3-day delivery services available in response to orders received through the use of on-line data base services.

STANDING ORDERS SUBSCRIPTION ACCOUNTS

Subscription orders for documents in the monthly issue of **Resources in Education** (RIE) are available on microfiche from EDRS. The microfiche are furnished on a diazo film base and without envelopes at $0.111 per microfiche. If you prefer a silver halide film base, the cost is $0.225 per microfiche and each microfiche is inserted into a protective envelope. SHIPPING CHARGES ARE EXTRA. A Standing Order Account may be opened by depositing $1,500.00 or submitting an executed purchase order. The cost of each issue and shipping will be charged against the account. A monthly statement of the account will be furnished.

BACK COLLECTIONS

Back collections of documents in all issues of **Resources in Education** (RIE) since 1966 are available on microfiche at a unit price of $0.131 per microfiche. The collections from 1966 through 1985 are furnished on a vesicular film base and without envelopes. Since 1986, collections are furnished on a diazo film base without envelopes. SHIPPING CHARGES ARE EXTRA. For pricing information, write or call toll free 1-800-443-ERIC (3742).

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. PRICE LIST
The prices set forth herein may be changed without notice; however, any price change is subject to the approval of the Contracting Officer/USED/Office of Educational Research and Improvement/Contracts and Grants Management Division.

2. PAYMENT
The prices set forth herein do not include any sales, use, excise, or similar taxes that may apply to the sale of microfiche or paper copy to the Customer. The cost of such taxes, if any, shall be borne by the Customer.

Payment shall be made net thirty (30) days from date of invoice. Payment shall be without expense to CBIS Federal.

3. REPRODUCTION
Express permission to reproduce a copyrighted document provided hereunder must be obtained from the copyright holder noted on the title page of such copyrighted document.

4. CONTINGENCIES
CBIS Federal shall not be liable to Customer or any other person for any failure or delay in the performance of any obligation if such failure or delay (a) is due to events beyond the control of CBIS Federal including, but not limited to, fire, storm, flood, earthquake, explosion, accident, acts of the public enemy, strikes, lockouts, labor disputes, labor shortages, work stoppages, transportation embargoes or delays, failure or shortage of materials, supplies or machinery, acts of God, or acts or regulations or priorities of the federal, state, or local governments; (b) is due to failures of performances of subcontractors beyond CBIS Federal's control and without negligence on the part of CBIS Federal; or (c) is due to erroneous or incomplete information furnished by Customer.

5. LIABILITY
CBIS Federal's liability, if any, arising hereunder shall not exceed restitution of charges.

In no event shall CBIS Federal be liable for special, consequential, or liquidated damages arising from the provision of services hereunder.

6. WARRANTY
CBIS FEDERAL MAKES NO WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, AS TO ANY MATTER WHATSOEVER, INCLUDING ANY WARRANTY OF MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR ANY PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

7. QUALITY
CBIS Federal will replace products returned because of reproduction defects or incompleteness. The quality of the input document is not the responsibility of CBIS Federal. Best available copy will be supplied.

8. CHANGES
No waiver, alteration, or modification of any of the provisions hereof shall be binding unless in writing and signed by an officer of CBIS Federal.

9. DEFAULT AND WAIVER

a. If customer fails with respect to this or any other agreement with CBIS Federal to pay any invoice when due or to accept any shipment as ordered, CBIS Federal may, without prejudice to other remedies, defer any further shipments until the default is corrected, or may cancel the order.

b. No course of conduct nor any delay of CBIS Federal in exercising any right hereunder shall waive any rights of CBIS Federal or modify this Agreement.

10. GOVERNING LAW
This Agreement shall be construed to be between merchants. Any questions concerning its validity, construction, or performance shall be governed by the laws of the State of Virginia.

11. DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS
Customers who have a continuing need for ERIC documents may open a Deposit Account by depositing a minimum of $300.00. Once a Deposit Account is opened, ERIC documents will be sent upon request, and the account charged for the actual cost and postage. A monthly statement of the account will be furnished.

12. PAPER COPY (PC)
A paper copy (PC) is a xerographic reproduction, on paper, of the original document. Each paper copy has a Vellum Bristol cover to identify and protect the document.

13. FOREIGN POSTAGE
Postage for all countries other than the United States is based on the International Postage Rates in effect at the time the order is shipped. To determine postage, allow 160 microfiche or 75 (PC) pages per pound. Customers must specify the exact classification of mail desired, and include the postage for that classification with their order. Payment must be in United States funds.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE